shipments after arrival at the destination, have recently been decided in accord in state courts. *St. Louis & San Francisco Ry.* v. *State et al.*, 26 Okla. 62; *State ex rel Railroad Commission of Indiana,* v. *Adams Express Co.*, 171 Ind. 138.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—RESTRICTIVE LABOR LAWS FOR WOMEN.—A Washington statute prohibited the employment of females in mechanical or mercantile establishments, laundries, restaurants or hotels for more than eight hours a day. Defendant, superintendent of a paper box factory, was arrested, tried, convicted and fined under an information charging her with employing a female nine hours in one day. Defendant appealed. *Held,* that the statute does not violate the fourteenth amendment to the United States constitution, or constitution of Washington, Art 1, Sec. 3, as depriving employers and employees of property without due process of law. *State* v. *Somerville* (Wash. 1912) 122 Pac. 324.

Freedom of contract is a property right under the fourteenth amendment, *Allgeyer* v. *Louisiana,* 165 U. S. 578. But limitation upon this freedom is a valid exercise of the police power when the circumstances under which labor is performed, *Holden* v. *Hardy,* 169 U. S. 366, or the condition of the persons engaged in it, *Muller* v. *Oregon,* 208 U. S. 412, 28 Sup. Ct. 324, require it. The principal case is a further affirmance of the constitutional right of a state to legislate for women in a way that is not yet held valid in the case of men. *Lochner* v. *New York,* 198 U. S. 45, 25 Sup. Ct. 539; *Muller* v. *Oregon, supra; Commonwealth* v. *Hamilton Mfg. Co.,* 120 Mass. 383. When the matter is a proper subject for legislative control the wisdom of particular legislation is a proper question for the legislature, not for the court. *Ah Lim* v. *Territory,* 1 Wash. 156; *State* v. *Buchanan,* 29 Wash. 602; *Cantwell* v. *State of Missouri,* 199 U. S. 602, 26 Sup. Ct. 749. Compare SEAGER on *The Attitude of American Courts Toward Restrictive Labor Legislation,* 19 POL. SCI. QUAR. 589. It is interesting to note that, while in *Ritchie & Co.* v. *Wayman,* 244 Ill. 509, the court in sustaining a similar ten hour law hinted that an eight hour restriction would be an unreasonable exercise of the police power; on the other hand the Washington court here takes judicial knowledge of the fact that in many industries eight hours is, even for men, a day's work by contract or by law. *Holden* v. *Hardy, supra.* Just as in the *Muller* and *Ritchie* cases the courts recognized the high tension in the kinds of employment mentioned; so here the court (CHADWICK, J. dissenting as to this point) sustained an exception in the statute in favor of the vegetable- fruit- and fish-packing industries, on the ground that as they afford merely temporary employment women working in them do not require the same protection as where employment lasts throughout the year. It is submitted that the Washington court here acted wisely in refusing to hold the statute a violation of the fourteenth amendment, thus leaving the way open for the case to be taken to the United States Supreme court on a writ of error if desired. § 237 Judiciary Act 1911. For further discussion see GOODNOW, *"Social Reform and the Constitution,"* pages 244-250; 8 MICH. L. REV. 499; 9 MICH. L. REV. 434; 10 MICH. L. REV. 492, 574.